

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim amendments/Status

In this response the subject matter of claims 2 and 7 have been transferred into claim 1, and claims 2 and 7 accordingly cancelled.

Claims 1, 2-6 and 8-13 remain pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The rejection of claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention are deemed overcome by the amendments made to the claims above.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 5-6 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by De Angelo (US 7010536), is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a specific container that contains only the features necessary for managing the interaction between a determined user class and a computing system, i.e. features relating to a particular business (see e.g. in our "preliminary amendment" text, which is referred to herein after, page 7, lines 6-11).

These features comprise more particularly the following knowledge: the application domain (5), the whole set of services of the application (6), information regarding the various users classes (7), the task that the user has to carry out (8), the various modes of perception and of action offered by the terminals (9) and the models (10) of the various classes of available terminals (see page 8, line 19 to page 9, line 25). Such features yield an interaction independent of the application and the interaction media.

On the contrary, the De Angelo reference discloses a plurality of containers the purpose of which is the creation and manipulation of information (see e.g. column 1, "field of the Invention"). Moreover, a first container may comprise a plurality of other containers (see e.g. figure 3B).

The different system architectures disclosed in De Angelo (figures 2A-2H) have no relationship with a four-tier architecture, and the different flowcharts of the known system (figures 5 to 12) fail to suggest any management of the interaction between a determined user class and a computing system.

Therefore, the known containers comprise, among others, a historical container logging the history of the interaction of that container with other containers (column 3, last paragraph), but nothing at all relating to an interaction with the user and the system.

It is disclosed in the De Angelo reference: "A container.... containing any information component" (column 3, lines 29-35, and figure 3C which comprises a lot of miscellaneous elements that are not claimed and which could prevent the claimed subject matter from operating correctly). However, this does mean that the known container might also contain our knowledge elements 5 to 10 cited hereinabove, because the purpose of the known container (creation and manipulation of information, as said hereinabove) has nothing to do with the purpose of our container, the latter not being suggested by the cited reference.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Angelo (US 7010536) in view of Kautto-Koivula et al. (US 20030117436), is respectfully traversed.

The secondary reference, Kautto-Koivula, discloses a method for personalizing a mobile phone, but nothing at all to do with a four-tier architecture or a method for managing of the interaction between a determined user class and a computing system. The combination of this reference together with the primary reference could never suggest the claimed method, and must be seen as referring to completely different architectures. It is submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: August 7, 2009
KMB/KJT/ser